DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 780 TM 011 020

AUTHOR Summerhill, William R.; And Others
TITLE Respondent Reactions to Selected Aspects of Mail Survey Instruments and Processes.
PUB DATE 10 Nov 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (Boston, MA, October 15, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Data Collection; Demography; Participant Satisfaction; Public Opinion; *Questionnaires; Sampling; Social Exchange Theory; Social Science Research; Socioeconomic Status; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Florida Cooperative Extension Service; *Mail Surveys; Respondent Behavior

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and preferences toward mail surveys were studied from the viewpoint of the recipient. Approximately 386 residents of a small rural community in Florida were sent a questionnaire about attitudes toward mail surveys, with half receiving a follow-up card after 4 days. A total of 123 usable questionnaires were returned. Respondents were asked about gender, family income, education level, and type of household. Thirty-four percent of the respondents were positive and 45% were neutral toward mail surveys. There was no difference in the percentage of respondents expressing negative feelings toward surveys among those receiving reminders and follow-up mailings and those responding immediately. There were no statistical associations between demographic characteristics and reactions. Features of the survey and survey processes influencing the responses are tabulated. The "Survey about Surveys" is included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290780

RESPONDENT REACTIONS TO SELECTED ASPECTS OF MAIL SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES

William R. Summerhill
Associate Professor and Evaluation Specialist

C. L. Taylor
Professor and Evaluation Specialist

Glenn D. Israel
Assistant Professor and Evaluation Specialist

Michael Sweat
County Extension Agent II

Program Evaluation and Organizational Development
Cooperative Extension Service
Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

November 10, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Summerhill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM 011 020

Update of Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Evaluation Association, Boston, Massachusetts, October 15, 1987

RESPONDENT REACTIONS TO SELECTED ASPECTS OF MAIL SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES

Introduction

The influence of various survey characteristics on response rate has been studied extensively, including length, format, study sponsorship, question sensitivity, incentives, mailing procedures, and others. In many cases, the findings are mixed (Berdie, Anderson, and Niebuhr, 1986). These studies have typically examined response rate from the standpoint of its statistical association with variations in mechanical and cosmetic aspects of the survey instrument and selected demographic attributes of respondents. Few studies have directly examined attitudes and preferences toward surveys from the recipient's perspective, particularly their perception of the influence of selected features of the survey instrument and mailing procedures on propensity to respond.

Mail surveys are extensively used by the Florida Cooperative Extension Service to obtain base line data for programming purposes and evaluative data for program improvement and accountability. In most cases, those surveyed are Extension "clientele", individuals and families that Extension works with on a continuing basis, or who are at a minimum on one or more Extension mailing lists to receive periodic information. There are two organizational concerns with surveying these populations. First, because of the need for a continuing productive relationship, there is the concern of maintaining people's confidence and good will. Second, there is the concern for maximizing survey response. Therefore the central purpose of this study was to assess attitudes of people toward mail surveys, and their perceptions of the influence of selected survey features and procedures on their willingness to respond.

The survey attempted to provide data about the following questions:

- What is the general reaction of people to mail surveys?
- How often are households and families surveyed by mail?
- What is the perceived influence of selected survey design features on willingness to respond?
- What is the reaction of people to collection of information about their attributes?
- What is the reaction to selected survey mailing procedures?

Social Exchange Theory as a Basis for Maximizing Response

According to Dillman (1978), the process of sending a questionnaire to prospective respondents and getting them to complete and return it in an honest manner can be viewed as a type of "social exchange". This theory developed by Homans (1961), Blau (1964), and others asserts that the actions of individuals are motivated by the return these actions are expected to bring, and usually do bring. A given behavior is therefore a function of the ratio between the perceived costs of doing an activity and the rewards one expects to be provided. This leads to three actions proposed as necessary to maximize response: minimize the costs for responding, maximize the rewards for doing so, and establish trust that those rewards will be delivered (Dillman, 1978).

As traditionally conceptualized, rewards that can be provided by those conducting surveys are limited. However in the development of a survey and its supporting communications, such things as expression of verbal appreciation, indicating positive regard for the respondent, use of a "consulting" approach, and support of one's values are felt to be rewarding to the respondent in their own right (Dillman, 1978).

Drawing from theory as well as a number of studies, Dillman (1978) and Berdie, et. al. (1986) propose that costs of responding can be reduced in a number of ways. With time a major cost, the shorter the questionnaire the better. Developing formats to

enhance the appearance of brevity, as well as simplicity and attractiveness can also have a positive influence in this regard. Other potential costs to respondents include having to formulate written responses to questions, difficult to understand directions, long and complex questions, the request for sensitive or "personal" information, suggestions of subordination, and direct monetary costs.

The idea of trust is also considered important. Token financial considerations are thought to convey a sense of trust. Likewise a stamped return envelope, the promise of a summary of results, the inclosure of a brochure, use of organizational letterhead, etc., are other proposed means of conveying trust.

Methodology

The population of the study consisted of approximately 800 residents of a small rural county in Florida who were holders of check cashing cards at the major supermarket in the county seat town. The check cashing card list had been used in a survey on family food management practices approximately two years before. A sample of 386 individuals was randomly selected from the list. The mailing procedure was basically that suggested by Dillman (1978). Each member of the sample was to receive two pieces of correspondence: a post card notifying the individual that he/she had been selected to be surveyed, indicating the importance of the survey, and asking for cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire; and a combination cover letter and questionnaire. In addition, one half of those sampled received an immediate follow-up card thanking them if they had completed and returned the questionnaire and reminding them to do so if they had not. This was done in an attempt to gain information about the impact of the immediate follow-up card on response rate. These mailings were spaced approximately four days apart. In order to identify non-respondents, each survey was given a number and that number was assigned to a specific individual being surveyed.

Approximately 10 days following the thank-you/reminder post card, or 14 days in the case of those purposely not sent one, a second questionnaire was mailed to those not yet responding. Approximately 7 days following the mailing of the second questionnaire, a final reminder post card was sent to those still not heard from. All pieces of correspondence were sent over the local Extension agent's signature.

Of the 386 pieces of correspondence sent initially, 97 were returned as non-deliverable. One hundred and twenty-three usable questionnaires were returned, a response rate of 43 percent. Previous Extension mail surveys utilizing this mailing process have consistently yielded a return of 60-75 percent. One possible explanation for the lower response lies with the nature of this survey in contrast to the typical ones conducted by Extension. Extension surveys typically address areas in which the recipients have an economic interest, such as farm or ranch enterprises, or that relate to some aspect of personal, family, or community status or well being. This survey relates to none of these, thereby potentially reducing the liklihood of attracting the degree of respondent attention or interest sufficient for a more creditable rate of response. This hypothesis appears to be supported by the findings as to factors influencing willingness to respond (pages 9-10). Clearly, the low rate serves as a potential source of bias in the findings.

Respondent Characteristics

In order that possible associations could be examined so as to better understand the responses, respondents were asked to provide information as to gender, family income, age, level of education, and type of household. The results are indicated in the following paragraphs and tables.

Sex

Seventy-four percent of the respondents were female, and 26 percent were male (Table 1). According to the population information (Smith, 1987), females were over-represented in the sample relative to the population of the county.

Table 1: Sex of Respondents.

	Frequency	Percent
Male	31	26
Female	86	74
Total	117	100

Family Income

Fifty percent of the respondents indicated a total family income of $30,000 or above (Table 2). The lower income groups were under-represented in the sample.

Table 2: Family Income of Respondents.

	Frequency	Percent
Less than $9,999	9	8
$10,000 - $14,999	15	13
$15,000 - $19,999	15	13
$20,000 - $29,999	17	15
$30,000 or above	57	50
Total	113	100

Age

The respondents tended to be distributed fairly evenly among age categories with the exception of those 25 years or less and those 65 and over (Table 3).

Table 3: Age of Respondents.

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 25	1	1
25 - 34	25	22
35 - 44	27	24
45 - 54	30	26
55 - 64	20	18
65 and over	11	10
Total	114	100

Education

Ninety two percent of the respondents had a high school education or above (Table 4). The lower education levels were under-represented in the sample in comparison to the general population.

Table 4: Level of Education.

	Frequency	Percent
Less than High School	9	8
High School	58	49
Some College	41	34
College Graduate	11	9
Total	119	100

Type of Household

The largest percent of the respondents (57 percent) were parents with children at home. Retirees were the next largest group (Table 5).

Table 5: Type of Household.

	Frequency	Percent
Single household or un-related persons	9	8
Single parent or couple with children at home	66	57
Single parent or couple without children at home	20	17
Retired household	21	18
Total	116	100

Findings

Reactions to Mail Surveys

Those sampled were asked how they felt in general about mail surveys. Twenty-one percent of those responding indicated a negative reaction. Thirty-four percent were positive, and 45 percent neither positive nor negative (Table 6). There were no statistical associations between the demographic characteristics and reactions toward mail surveys. And, there appeared to be no difference in the reactions of early and late respondents in terms of being negative to mail surveys. Late respondents tended to be more neutral and less positive than did early respondents, however.

Table 6: Reactions to Being Asked to Respond to Mail Surveys.

	Frequency	Percent
Very positive	19	17
Somewhat positive	19	17
Neither positive nor negative	49	45
Somewhat negative	17	16
Very negative	5	5
Total	109	100

Number of Surveys Received

Respondents were asked the number of surveys typically received during a year. Sixty-two percent indicated receiving two or more surveys in a typical year (Table 7).

Table 7: Number of Surveys Received Annually.

	Frequency	Percent
One or less	46	38
Two or three	55	46
Four or more	20	16
Total	121	100

Association Between Number of Surveys Received and Reactions to Mail Surveys

The potential association between number of surveys received and reactions to mail surveys was tested by Chi-square. A weak association was identified. There was a slight tendency for those receiving a greater number of surveys to be more negative to surveys than those receiving a lesser number.

Influence of Selected Survey Features on Willingness to Respond

Prospective respondents were presented a list of 14 survey features and asked to indicate the extent of influence of each on their being willing to complete and return a mail survey. The features listed are generally considered to be within the social exchange dimensions of rewards, cost reduction, or trust. The respondents were asked to rate each feature on a four point scale of potential influence on willingness to respond. The scale and assigned point values are as follows: strong influence (3), moderate influence (2), a little influence (1), and no influence (0). Frequency and percent of response and mean response score were calculated for each item.

The features are presented in the following table in the order of greatest amount of influence, based on mean score (Table 8).

Table 8: Respondent Rating of the Influence of Selected Survey Features on Willingness to Respond to a Mail Survey

Feature	Influence Rating (frequency and percent*) Strong (3)	Moderate (2)	A Little (1)	None (0)	$\bar{X}$
Providing specific answer categories rather than asking for written response (N = 120)	88 (73)	24 (20)	6 (5)	2 (2)	2.67
Relevance of survey to situation or interests (N = 118)	80 (68)	29 (25)	5 (4)	4 (3)	2.57
Short question statements (N = 119)	71 (60)	36 (30)	8 (7)	4 (3)	2.46
Inclusion of pre-addressed postage paid return envelope (N = 119)	74 (62)	27 (23)	12 (10)	6 (5)	2.42

* Percents in parenthesis

Feature	Influence Rating (frequency and percent*) Strong (3)	Moderate (2)	A Little (1)	None (0)	$\bar{X}$
From organization or agency having direct contact or relationship with respondent (N = 118)	57 (48)	39 (33)	13 (11)	9 (7)	2.22
Large easy to read print (N = 118)	55 (47)	39 (33)	17 (14)	7 (6)	2.20
From local organization or agency rather than non-local source (N= 119)	52 (44)	36 (30)	20 (17)	11 (9)	2.08
Two pages or less in length (N = 117)	47 (40)	40 (34)	21 (18)	9 (8)	2.07
Identified with University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Science (N = 116)	34 (29)	50 (43)	20 (18)	12 (10)	1.91
Promise of summary of results (N = 119)	38 (32)	46 (39)	21 (17)	14 (12)	1.91
Distinctive logo or heading identifying the study (N = 118)	40 (34)	38 (32)	24 (20)	16 (14)	1.86
Four pages or less in length (N = 118)	32 (27)	39 (33)	31 (26)	16 (14)	1.74
Magazine or book quality (N = 118)	18 (15)	35 (30)	35 (30)	29 (25)	1.35
Booklet form rather than sheets stapled together (N = 118)	18 (15)	31 (26)	31 (26)	38 (32)	1.25

* Percents in parenthesis

All of the listed features were perceived as having some degree of positive influence on willingness to respond to a mail survey. Features relating to ease of response and relevance of the survey received the highest influence ratings (the high score for relevance would seem to bear out the earlier supposition about the lower response to this particular survey). These were followed by features relating to organizational identity, and lastly by features relating to the "cosmetics" of the instrument.

Ratings on several features were statistically associated (Chi-square) with specific demographic variables.

Ratings for organizational contact were associated with income and age. Respondents with income between $15,000 and $30,000 tended to rate prior contact or relationship with the survey source as a stronger influence on willingness to respond than did those of lower or higher income categories. Respondents under 35 years of age and those 45-64 tended to rate organizational contact more important than did those in other categories.

Ratings for two pages or less in length as an influence on willingness to respond were associated with sex of respondent, with males giving a slightly higher rating for influence than females.

Ratings for identification of survey with the University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences were strongly associated with age, with older respondents tending to give a higher rating for influence than younger respondents.

Ratings for four pages or less in length were associated with educational level and type of household. In general, the higher the educational level the more positive respondents were toward questionnaires of four pages or less in length. Households with no children at home tended to be more positive toward this feature than were single or retired households or those with children at home.

Ratings for magazine or book quality of the survey were associated with income.

Respondents of lower income levels tended to rate this feature higher for influence than did those of higher income levels.

Respondent Reactions Toward Requests for Information on Selected Demographic Characteristics and Attributes

Those surveyed were asked for their reaction to requests for information on selected demographic characteristics and attributes. These characteristics have particular relevance to targeting Extension audiences for programming purposes, and therefore particular relevance when collecting survey information. The characteristics and attributes and respondent reactions to each are listed in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Respondent Reactions to Requests for Information on Demographic Characteristics and Attributes

Characteristic/Attribute	Reactions (frequency and percent*) Does Not Bother Me	Somewhat Negative	Very Negative
Sex (N=119)	112 (94)	4 (3)	3 (3)
Race (N = 119)	111 (93)	4 (3)	4 (3)
Number in Family (N=119)	111 (93)	5 (4)	3 (3)
Age (N =119)	109 (92)	7 (6)	3 (2)
Level of Education (N=119)	106 (89)	10 (8)	3 (3)
Practices (N=118)	91 (77)	19 (16)	8 (7)
Size of Enterprise (N=117)	77 (66)	25 (21)	15 (13)
Income (broad dollar categories) (N=118)	53 (45)	44 (38)	21 (18)
Income (specific dollar amounts) (N=120)	32 (27)	47 (39)	41 (34)

* Percents in parenthesis

Providing information on sex, age, race, number in family, and educational level did not seem to be of particular concern to most of the respondents. Practices carried out and size of enterprise were negative for 23 and 34 percent of the respondents, respectively. The most negative attributes were income, particularly in specific dollar amounts.

Reactions were associated with demographic characteristics/attributes in some instances.

Respondents 65 years of age or above, and those retired tended to be more negative to reporting their gender than did respondents of other age groups.

Retired respondents and those in lower income categories tended to be more negative to reporting level of education than younger respondents.

Lower income respondents tended to be more negative to reporting race than higher income respondents.

Respondents with less than $15,000 family income and $30,000 or above tended to be more negative toward reporting size of enterprise than did those with incomes of $15,000 - $29,999. Respondents in lower education categories tended to be more negative toward reporting size of enterprise than those in higher education categories.

Influence of Mailing Procedures

In an attempt to test the influence of a "thank you/reminder" communique in immediate followup to the first mailing of the survey instrument, one-half of the potential respondents were sent a post card and one-half were not. The number responding in each category were assessed at three points: two days following the mailing of the second questionnaire to those not yet responding to the first one; two days following the mailing of the final reminder card to those not yet responding to the second questionnaire; and, at the time of writing this paper. Response at time of

mailing the second questionnaire were clearly in favor of those sent the immediate follow-up card, 39 to 28 (Table 11). The difference had narrowed somewhat at the time of mailing the final reminder card, but was still in favor of the immediate follow-up card group 55 to 50. Following the final card, eighteen additional questionnaires were received, with the final difference being 65 to 58.

Table 11: Return of Questionnaires, Immediate Follow-up Communique versus No Immediate Follow-up Communique.

	Number Returned at Estimated Time of:		
	Respondent Reciept of Second Questionnaire	Respondent Receipt of Final Follow-up Comminique	Following Final Follow-up Comminique
Immediate follow-up card	39	55	65
No follow-up card	28	50	58
Percent increase by using follow-up card	39%	10%	12%

Based on the above data, it would appear that the use of an immediate follow-up communique has a positive effect on rate of response, particularly in the short term. As additional mailings were sent, the gap remained but narrowed. With the number of returns from this particular study the actual number difference was small, but if the distinction held true with larger returns, the difference could encompass a substantial number of responses.

Respondents were asked about the influence of pre and follow-up communiques on return of the survey and their likely action if sent a second survey instrument in the case of non-response to the first one.

Forty-six percent felt that a communique (pre-letter or card) prior to sending the survey alerting the individual that he/she had been selected to receive a survey would

cause them to be more likely to respond. Fifty-two percent felt that a pre-communique would have no effect one way or the other, and the remainder (2 percent) felt that a pre-communique would have a negative effect on their willingness to respond (Table 12).

Table 12: Perceived Influence of Pre Survey-Communique on Propensity to Respond.

	Frequency	Percent
Positive	55	46
Neither Positive nor Negative	63	52
Negative	3	2
Total	121	100

Fifty-nine percent felt that a follow-up thank you/reminder communique (card or letter) would encourage them to complete and return the survey if they had not already done so. Thirty-four percent felt it would have no effect one way or the other, and 7 percent felt it would have a negative effect (Table 13).

Table 13: Effect of Post Survey Communique on Propensity to Respond.

	Frequency	Percent
Encourage Response	72	59
No Effect on Response	41	34
Discourage Response	8	7
Total	121	100

Seventy one percent indicated that if sent a second survey form in the case of their non-response to the first one, they would probably complete and return the form. Twenty-five percent indicated that they would probably ignore the request and discard

the form (Table 14). Seventy five percent indicated that they would probably complete and return it.

Table 14: Effect of Second Survey Form on Response.

	Frequency	Percent
Probably Complete and Return	88	75
Probably Ignore and Discard	30	25
Total	118	100

Summary and Conclusions

A substantial majority of the respondents tended to be either positive or at least neutral toward mail surveys. This is encouraging, particularly with regard to concern for potentially damaging people's good will toward the surveying organization by asking them to respond. The findings also revealed no difference in percent of respondents expressing negative feelings toward surveys among those received following reminder/follow-up mailings, vis-a-vis those immediately responding. Unfortunately, the ability to generalize these data to the larger populations is somewhat limited due to the rate of response.

If the responses are any indication, it does not appear that the majority of people are being "besieged" by mail surveys, although a large percent of the respondents indicated receiving one or more annually.

All the survey features listed were perceived as having some degree of positive influence on willingness to respond. This may have been to some extent a function of the one directional response scale, however. The findings of positive influence for the features tends to support the exchange concept proposed by Dillman (1978) and others. Attention to maximizing the pertinence of the survey to the respondent and facilitating ease and quickness of response would seem to be particularly warranted in terms of

survey design. Of least importance would seem to be features relating to the assembly or "cosmetics" of the instrument.

Within the realm of personal attributes, size of enterprise and practices implemented tend to be important information to Extension in terms of both base line and evaluative data. Based on the findings of the study, a number of people have a negative reaction to being asked to supply this information. This would indicate that Extension surveys should only ask for information in these categories that is essential, and be quite clear in expressing its importance to the development of programs that will be of benefit to those being asked to respond. This is even more true with income information. When income is included, specific categories should be provided in order to reduce refusals and missing data.

Finally, it would appear at least from the standpoint of those responding to this study, that pre and post survey communiques are worthwhile in encouraging response. This further substantiates Dillman's (1978) and other's emphasis on a systematic multi-wave approach incorporating aspects facilitating reward, reduction of cost, and enhancement of trust.

References

Berdie, Doug R., Anderson, John F., and Niebuhr, Marsha A. 1986. Questionnaires: Design and Use. Second Edition. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Blau, Peter M. 1964. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Dillman, Don A. 1978. Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Homans, George C. 1961. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Smith, Stanley K., and Ahmed, Bashir. 1987. Population Studies. Population Program, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

WRS:32 11/87

FLORIDA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE — AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION — COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

REPLY TO:

Rt. 3, Box 1074-B
Macclenny, FL 32063
September 22, 1987

Dear Extension Friend:

As indicated in the post card that you received a few days ago, we are attempting to improve our information collection process. From time to time we conduct surveys of individuals and groups by mail to obtain information important to the development and evaluation of our Extension education programs. As you may recall, one such survey was on Family Food Management Practices.

In general, response to mail surveys is excellent and the results most beneficial. We try to make the survey process as little imposition as possible and not mistreat in any way people's good will or confidence. It is also our desire to utilize the most effective techniques, thereby increasing the efficiency of the effort. Therefore, we would like to "impose" on you for a few minutes to give us your reactions to various aspects of mail surveys, and your opinions as to how this procedure could be improved.

We would very much appreciate your filling out and returning this questionnaire. Our Program Evaluation Office at the University will tabulate the results. A postage paid envelope is provided for your use. You will notice a number at the top of this page. It is used only to be sure that you are not bothered by reminder notices once the questionnaire is returned.

The survey will only take a few minutes to complete. We value your opinion very much! If you have any questions, call us at 259-3520. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Michael Sweat
Extension Agent for Agriculture/4-H

P.S. If you would like a summary of the survey results, we would be glad to send one to you. Just check here: _____

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF FLORIDA, IFAS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND BOARDS OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COOPERATING

A SURVEY ABOUT SURVEYS

1. In general, how do you feel about being asked to respond to mail surveys? (circle number beside response selected)

1 Very Positive	4 Somewhat Negative
2 Somewhat Positive	5 Very Negative
3 Neither Positive nor Negative	

2. To what extent would each of the following be a positive influence on your willingness to complete and return a mail survey? (circle response selected)

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	A Little Influence	No Influence
a. The inclusion of a pre-addressed, postage paid return envelope.	SI	MI	LI	NI
b. A survey printed in booklet form rather than sheets of paper stapled in the upper left hand corner.	SI	MI	LI	NI
c. A survey bearing a distinctive logo or heading identifying the particular study.....	SI	MI	LI	NI
d. A survey of four pages or less in length (two sheets of paper printed on both front and back).	SI	MI	LI	NI
e. A survey with magazine or book quality printing (versus mimeo or photocopy).	SI	MI	LI	NI
f. A survey with large, easy to read print.	SI	MI	LI	NI
g. A survey of two pages or less in length (one sheet of paper printed on both front and back).	SI	MI	LI	NI
h. A survey particularly relevant to your situation or interests.	SI	MI	LI	NI
i. A survey identified with the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences of the University of Florida.....	SI	MI	LI	NI
j. A survey with short question statements.	SI	MI	LI	NI
k. A survey providing specific categories for answers rather than asking for responses to be written out.	SI	MI	LI	NI
l. A survey from a local organization or agency rather than from a non-local source.	SI	MI	LI	NI

	Strong Influence	Moderate Influence	A Little Influence	No Influence
m. The promise of a summary of the survey results.	SI	MI	LI	NI
n. A survey from an organization or agency with which you have had direct contact or relationship.	SI	MI	LI	NI

3. Often questions are asked about characteristics of those responding, such as their race, sex, age, etc. How do you feel about being asked for information on these areas?

	Does Not Bother Me	Somewhat Negative	Very Negative
a. Your sex	NB	SN	VN
b. Your age	NB	SN	VN
c. Your race	NB	SN	VN
d. Your income (in specific dollar amount)	NB	SN	VN
e. Your income (in broad dollar categories).....	NB	SN	VN
f. Number in your family or household.....	NB	SN	VN
g. Your level of education	NB	SN	VN
h. Size of your enterprise or business.....	NB	SN	VN
i. Things that you do—your practices.....	NB	SN	VN

4. On the average, approximately how many mail surveys do you receive during a year? (circle number beside response selected)

1 One or less 2 Two or three 3 Four or more

5. Sometimes before a survey is mailed out, a post card or letter is sent alerting those selected that they will be receiving the survey. How do you feel about this? (select one response)

1 I would be more likely to complete and return the survey.

2 It would have no effect on my completing and returning the survey.

3 I would be less likely to complete and return the survey.

6. Sometimes when a survey is sent out, a postcard is sent about three days afterwards expressing thanks if the person has already completed and returned the survey and reminding them to please return it if they have not yet done so. How do you feel about this follow-up? (select one response)

1 It would encourage me to complete and return the survey if I had not already done so.

2 It would have little or no effect one way or the other on my ultimately completing and returning the survey.

3 It would discourage me from completing and returning the survey if I had not already done so.

over

7. Sometimes when people fail to return the survey within a week or so, a reminder letter with another survey form is sent to them. If this were your case, what do you think your actions would be? (select one response)

   1 I would probably complete and return the survey form.

   2 I would probably ignore the request and discard the form.

Finally, we would like to ask you to share some information about yourself for statistical purposes.

8. Sex:

   1 Male
   2 Female

9. Total family income per year:

   1 Less than $9,999
   2 $10,000 - $14,999
   3 $15,000 - $19,999
   4 $20,000 - $29,999
   5 $30,000 or above

10. Age: _____

11. Education:

   1 Less than High School
   2 High School
   3 Some College
   4 College Graduate

12. Type of Household: (circle all appropriate)

   1 Single Household or Unrelated Persons
   2 Single parent or couple With Children at Home
   3 Single Parent or Couple Without Children at Home
   4 Retired Household

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!

Please return this survey in the enclosed business reply envelope to:

Program Evaluation and Organizational Development
311 Rolfs Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611